



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/347,315	07/02/99	TALWAR	

JAYADEEP R DESHMUKH
RANBAXY LABORATORIES LIMITED
600 COLLEGE ROAD EAST
SUITE 2100
PRINCETON NJ 08540

HM12/0829

WARE, T EXAMINER

ART. UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1615	

DATE MAILED: 08/29/00 7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/347,315

Applicant(s)

Talwar et al

Examiner

Todd D. War

Group Art Unit
1615



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 20, 1900

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1035 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☒ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) 09/152,395.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 4

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 1615

DETAILED ACTION

CONTINUED PROSECUTION APPLICATION TREATED AS CONTINUED EXAMINATION UNDER 37 CFR 1.114

The request for a continued prosecution application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) filed on 7-20-00 is acknowledged. 37 CFR 1.53(d)(1) was amended to provide that the prior application of a CPA must be: (1) a utility or plant application that was filed under 35 U.S.C. 111(a) before May 29, 2000, (2) a design application, or (3) the national stage of an international application that was filed under 35 U.S.C. 363 before May 29, 2000. *See Changes to Application Examination and Provisional Application Practice*, interim rule, 65 *Fed. Reg.* 14865, 14872 (Mar. 20, 2000), 1233 *Off. Gaz. Pat. Office* 47, 52 (Apr. 11, 2000). Since a CPA of this application is not permitted under 37 CFR 1.53(d)(1), the improper request for a CPA is being treated as a request for continued examination of this application under 37 CFR 1.114. *See id.* at 14866, 1233 *Off. Gaz. Pat. Office* at 48.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1615

2. Claims 1-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term viscolyzing agent is unclear, since no definition is provided as to whether the agent is meant to increase or decrease viscosity. Furthermore, it appears the term may be used contrary to applicants' intent. "-Lyzing" connotes "breaking" or "decreasing" such as in the word "hydrolyze." However, it appears applicants intend to increase viscosity with the "viscolyzing agent," since the disclosed viscolyzing agents are various gums. Clarification is requested. The examiner suggests amending the claim with "viscosity enhancing agent" to overcome this rejection, if applicants' intent is to increase viscosity.

3. A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481

Art Unit: 1615

(Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 2 recites the broad recitation therapeutic drugs, and the claim also recites chemotherapeutic, antibiotic, anti-cancer, etc which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-26 and 32-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuhrts (5,292,518; hereafter '518).

'518 teaches prolonged-release drug tablet formulations comprising poly-uronic acids, gums, carbonates, crosslinked polyvinylpyrrolidone, and edible organic acids, wherein the formulations provide controlled release in the stomach and intestines (C2, L18-22; C5, L58-C6, L7; C6, L14-17, 61-C7, L14; Examples). '518 teaches that the active compound is not critical, but that antihistamines may be incorporated into the composition. Also, it is the position of the examiner that since the mixture is blended together that the mixture of '518 is homogenous. '518 teaches the ranges or ingredients of the instant application.

6. Claims 1-6, 9-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chauhan et al (5,597,844; hereafter '844).

Art Unit: 1615

'844 teaches tablet compositions of cimetidine, crosslinked polyvinylpyrrolidone, bicarbonates, poly-uronic acids, hydroxypropylmethylcellulose, and gums (C2, L43-C3 L15; Examples). The compositions of '844 float on the contents of the stomach and are blended together in a dry powder mix. It is the position of the examiner, in the absence of unexpected results, that it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to substitute cimetidine with ranitidine, since both are H₂-antagonists with the reasonable expected result of blocking H₂-receptors in an effort to treat stomach ulceration.

7. Claims 1-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuhrts (5,292,518; hereafter '518) Chauhan et al (5,597,844; hereafter '844) or vice versa.

'518 teaches prolonged-release drug tablet formulations comprising poly-uronic acids, gums, carbonates, crosslinked polyvinylpyrrolidone, and edible organic acids, wherein the formulations provide controlled release in the stomach and intestines (C2, L18-22; C5, L58-C6, L7; C6, L14-17, 61-C7, L14; Examples). '518 teaches that the active compound is not critical, but that antihistamines may be incorporated into the composition. Also, it is the position of the examiner that since the mixture is blended together that the mixture of '518 is homogenous. '518 teaches the ranges or ingredients of the instant application.

'844 teaches tablet compositions of cimetidine, crosslinked polyvinylpyrrolidone, bicarbonates, poly-uronic acids, hydroxypropylmethylcellulose, and gums (C2, L43-C3 L15; Examples). The compositions of '844 float on the contents of the stomach and are blended together in a dry powder mix. It is the position of the examiner, in the absence of unexpected

Art Unit: 1615

results, that it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to substitute cimetidine with ranitidine, since both are H₂-antagonists with the reasonable expected result of blocking H₂-receptors in an effort to treat stomach ulceration.

'518 does not teach the inclusion of hydroxypropylmethylcellulose in the drug tablet formulations. However, based upon the teachings of '844, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to include hydroxypropylmethylcellulose in an effort to modulate the viscosity of the composition. While '518 teaches the inclusion of poly-uronic acids, it is not clear whether '518 specifically teaches that alginates are poly-uronic acids, since '518 teaches algal polysaccharides. '844, however teaches that alginate is a poly-uronic acid, and it would therefore be obvious to one skilled in the art to substitute alginate for pectin.

'844 does not teach the inclusion of edible organic acids in the drug tablet formulations. However, based upon the teachings of '518, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to include edible organic acids in an effort to modify the flavor of the composition.

Conclusion

**ACTION IS FINAL, FIRST ACTION FOLLOWING REQUEST FOR CONTINUED
EXAMINATION UNDER 37 CFR 1.114**

All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of

Art Unit: 1615

record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Todd Ware whose telephone number is (703) 305-1700. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman Page, can be reached on (703) 308-2927. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4556.

Art Unit: 1615

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235 or 308-1234.

THURMAN K. PAGE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

tw

8-23-00